

Subj: **ellsberg working version june 30**
Date: Thursday, June 30, 2005 5:19:35 PM
From: nes.com
To: 1

Dan,

This is a terrific piece. Thank you.

I'm going to try to squeeze in 700 words, but won't know until tomorrow how close we can get. Toward that end, I picked a little here and there, trying to blend. I revised to condense, and trimmed outright. I couldn't simply take the 700-plus word version you sent because the shorter version, already tweaked and copy edited, had to serve as our starting point.

Please take a look. We can make revisions tomorrow morning. But please make your changes in a manner I can easily spot because we're hard by deadlines now. The copy desk has gone, and will be in a race tomorrow when they get in. Maybe you could make your additions in all caps and then place asterisks around the phrases, sentences, etc. you want to delete?

Also, I revised your opening sentence just to take it out of passive voice. The thoughts are the same, words the same, just the construction. Here again, if you're not comfortable with it, please revise. These are your words, obviously.

Drex

President Bush's explanation Tuesday night for staying the course in Iraq evoked in me a sense of familiarity, but not nostalgia. I had heard virtually all of his themes before, almost word for word, in speeches delivered by three presidents I worked for: John F. Kennedy, Lyndon B. Johnson and Richard M. Nixon. Not with pride, I recognized that I had proposed some of those very words myself.

Drafting a speech on Vietnam for Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara in July of 1965, I had the same task as Bush's speechwriters in June 2005: how to rationalize and motivate continued public support for a hopelessly stalemated, unnecessary war our president had lied us into.

Looking back on my draft, I find I used the word "terrorist" about our adversaries TO THE SAME EFFECT Bush did. Like Bush's advisors, I, too, felt the need for a global threat to explain the scale of effort we faced. For that role, I felt "China" was better suited as our "real" adversary than North Vietnam's Ho Chi Minh, just as Bush now prefers to focus on Al Qaeda rather than Iraqi nationalists. "They are trying to shake our will in Iraq—just as they [sic] tried to shake our will on Sept. 11, 2001," he said.

My draft was approved by McNamara, National Security Advisor McGeorge Bundy and Secretary of State Dean Rusk, but it was not delivered because it was a clarion call for mobilizing the reserves to support an open-ended escalation of troops. (The counterpart now would be to reinstitute the draft). Johnson chose instead to make a rather off-hand AND DECEPTIVE statement at a press conference because he wanted to conceal what his military advisors were telling him was necessary to succeed.

A note particularly reminiscent in Bush's speech was his reference to "a time of testing." "We have more work to do, and there will be tough moments that test America's resolve...," he said.

This theme recalled a passage in my 1965 draft that, for reasons that will be evident, I have never chosen to reproduce before. I ended by painting a picture of Communist China as "an opponent that views international politics as a whole as a vast guerrilla struggle, in which a stronger enemy's weak points are to be found and patiently exploited. A Communist world dominated by Peking, they know, lies a long way off. But the way to it is the guerrilla's way, intimidating, ambushing, demoralizing and weakening those who would uphold an alternative world order.

President Bush's explanation Tuesday night for staying the course in Iraq evoked in me a sense of familiarity, but not nostalgia. I had heard virtually all of his themes before, almost word for word, in speeches delivered by three presidents I worked for: John F. Kennedy, Lyndon B. Johnson and Richard M. Nixon. Not with pride, I recognized that I had proposed some of those very words myself.

Drafting a speech on Vietnam for Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara in July of 1965, I had the same task as Bush's speechwriters in June 2005: how to rationalize and motivate continued public support for a hopelessly stalemated, unnecessary war our president had lied us into.

Looking back on my draft, I find I used the word "terrorist" about our adversaries **even more than TO THE SAME EFFECT THAT** Bush did. ALSO, like Bush's advisors, I, [too], felt the need for a global threat to explain the scale of effort we faced. For that role, I felt "China" was better suited as our "real" adversary than North Vietnam's Ho Chi Minh, just as Bush now prefers to focus on Al Qaeda rather than Iraqi nationalists. "They are trying to shake our will in Iraq—just as they [sic] tried to shake our will on Sept. 11, 2001," he said.

My draft was approved by McNamara, National Security Advisor McGeorge Bundy and Secretary of State Dean Rusk, but it was not delivered because it was a clarion call for mobilizing the reserves to support an open-ended escalation of troops. (The counterpart now would be to reinstitute the draft). Johnson chose instead to make a rather off-hand AND DECEPTIVE statement at a press conference because he wanted to conceal what his military advisors were telling him was necessary to succeed. *(Perhaps spell out in a sentence)*

A note particularly reminiscent in Bush's speech was his reference to "a time of testing." "We have more work to do, and there will be tough moments that test America's resolve..." he said.

This theme recalled a passage in my 1965 draft that, for reasons that will be evident, I have never chosen to reproduce before. I ended by painting a picture of Communist China as "an opponent that views international politics as a whole as a vast guerrilla struggle, in which a stronger enemy's weak points are to be found and patiently exploited. A Communist world dominated by Peking, they know, lies a long way off. But the way to it is the guerrilla's way, intimidating, ambushing, demoralizing and weakening those who would uphold an alternative world order."

*That
they
were
requesting
many
more
troops*

*much
larger*

"We are being tested," I wrote. "Have we the guts, the grit, the determination to stick with a frustrating, bloody, difficult course as long as it takes to see it through...? The Asian Communists are sure that we have not." [Note to White House speechwriters — ~~in years ahead~~ substitute, Al Qaeda, or later, Iran, or still later, China again.]

Tuesday, Bush said: Our adversaries "believe that free societies are essentially corrupt and decadent, and with a few hard blows they can force us to retreat."

Bush's speechwriters, LIKE ME, then faced this question from the other side. To meet the enemy's test of resolve, how long must the American public support American troops as they kill and die in **[Iraq]** A FOREIGN LAND? Their answer came in the same workmanlike evasions that served Kennedy, Johnson and Nixon: "as long as it takes (and not a day longer)...until the fight is won..."

I no longer commend I CAN HARDLY BEAR TO REREAD my own proposed response IN 1965 to that question, which drew on a famous riposte by **former Democratic presidential nominee** FORMER [or, THE RECENTLY-DECEASED] UN AMBASSADOR Adlai Stevenson during the Cuban Missile Crisis:

"There is only one answer for us to give. It was made...by an American statesman...in the midst of another crisis that tested our resolution. "'Till hell freezes over.'" **[remove internal quotes from last phrase]**

It doesn't feel any better to hear similar words from yet another president 40 years on, nor will they read any better to his speechwriters years from now. But the human pain they foretell will not be mainly theirs.

but we're
using
al Qaeda
now
cut
Have
about
cutting
in years
ahead

President Bush's explanation Tuesday night for staying the course in Iraq evoked in me a sense of familiarity, but not nostalgia. I had heard virtually all of his themes before, almost word for word, in speeches delivered by three presidents I worked for: John F. Kennedy, Lyndon B. Johnson and Richard M. Nixon. Not with pride, I recognized that I had proposed some of those very words myself.

Drafting a speech on Vietnam for Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara in July of 1965, I had the same task as Bush's speechwriters in June 2005: how to rationalize and motivate continued public support for a hopelessly stalemated, unnecessary war our president had lied us into.

Looking back on my draft, I find I used the word "terrorist" about our adversaries [**even more than**] TO THE SAME EFFECT THAT Bush did. ALSO, like Bush's advisors, I, [**too**], felt the need for a global threat to explain the scale of effort we faced. For that role, I felt "China" was better suited as our "real" adversary than North Vietnam's Ho Chi Minh, just as Bush now prefers to focus on Al Qaeda rather than Iraqi nationalists. "They are trying to shake our will in Iraq—just as they [sic] tried to shake our will on Sept. 11, 2001," he said.

My draft was approved by McNamara, National Security Advisor McGeorge Bundy and Secretary of State Dean Rusk, but it was not delivered because it was a clarion call for mobilizing the reserves to support an open-ended escalation of troops. (The counterpart now would be to reinstitute the draft). Johnson [**chose instead to make a rather off-hand AND DECEPTIVE statement at a press conference because he wanted to conceal what his military advisors were telling him was necessary to succeed**]. PREFERRED PUBLICLY TO UNDERESTIMATE BY HALF THE NUMBER OF TROOPS HE WAS SENDING IMMEDIATELY, AND TO PRETEND THAT THE SMALLER NUMBER WAS ALL HIS MILITARY COMMANDERS FELT WAS NECESSARY AT THE TIME. (I TAKE WITH A GRAIN OF SALT BUSH'S CLAIM THAT "OUR COMMANDERS TELL ME THEY HAVE THE NUMBER OF TROOPS THEY NEED TO DO THEIR JOB.)

A note particularly reminiscent in Bush's speech was his reference to "a time of testing." "We have more work to do, and there will be tough moments that test America's resolve..." he said.

This theme recalled a passage in my 1965 draft that, for reasons that will be evident, I have never chosen to reproduce before. I ended by painting a picture of Communist China [NOTE TO WHITE SPEECHWRITERS—SUBSTITUTE AL

QAEDA, OR LATER, IRAN, OR STILL LATER, CHINA AGAIN] as “an opponent that views international politics as a whole as a vast guerrilla struggle,[**in which a stronger enemy’s weak points are to be found and patiently exploited.]**[A Communist world dominated by Peking, they know, lies a long way off. But the way to it is the guerrilla’s way] ... intimidating, ambushing, demoralizing and weakening those who would uphold an alternative world order.”

“We are being tested,” I wrote. “Have we the guts, the grit, the determination to stick with a frustrating, bloody, difficult course as long as it takes to see it through...? The Asian Communists are sure that we have not.” **[Note to White House speechwriters—in years ahead-- substitute, Al Qaeda, or later, Iran, or still later, China again.]** Tuesday, Bush said: Our adversaries “believe that free societies are essentially corrupt and decadent, and with a few hard blows they can force us to retreat.”

Bush’s speechwriters, LIKE ME, then faced this question from the other side. To meet the enemy’s test of resolve, how long must the American public support American troops as they kill and die in **[Iraq]** A FOREIGN LAND? Their answer came in the same workmanlike evasions that served Kennedy, Johnson and Nixon: “as long as **[it takes]** WE ARE NEEDED (and not a day longer)...until the fight is won.**[...]**”

[I no longer commend] I CAN HARDLY BEAR TO REREAD my own proposed response IN 1965 to that question, which drew on a famous riposte by **[former Democratic presidential nominee]** FORMER [or, THE RECENTLY-DECEASED, or THE LATE] UN AMBASSADOR Adlai Stevenson during the Cuban Missile Crisis:

“There is only one answer for us to give. It was made...by an American statesman...in the midst of another crisis that tested our resolution. “Till hell freezes over.” **[remove internal quotes from last phrase]**

It doesn’t feel any better to hear similar words from yet another president 40 years on, nor will they read any better to his speechwriters years from now. But the human pain they foretell will not be mainly theirs.

Subj: **Ellsberg 2d edit July 1**
Date: Friday, July 1, 2005 7:51:29 AM
To: nes.com

Dear Drex: On going over it, I appreciate all the more your careful editing. I've put deletions both in bold and, in case that doesn't come through, in brackets. (There are also brackets in the text, but I don't think that should be confusing.) My suggested replacements are in caps.

I I'm here to talk--510-526-2605--about any of the suggested changes. I put the note to White House speechwriters earlier (and took out "in years ahead," since they're already referring to Al Qaeda), because it seemed to break the flow later.

I shortened your addition about the guerrilla struggle, to make room for a longer comment about LBJ's reason for not giving my speech; not only to make it more comprehensible, but because I think my parenthetical comment is very timely and powerful (if I may say that) in connection with this very speech by Bush. (I think it raises the question whether Bush is imitating LBJ's deception on this point--I have virtually no doubt of it--sufficiently tentatively: "a grain of salt.")

It's a problem how to present the points in the preceding sentence (LBJ "preferred publicly...") concisely. There are several points here, and if there's an intense space problem, let's talk about how to shorten this if necessary; it would be easy to make this misleading, or inadequate, if it were simply compressed.

The double spacing in the middle is simply a glitch in my new machine.

I hope you can make this out. Let's talk. Yours, Dan

Write	summary	Slug: op-ellsberg3
-------	---------	--------------------

rimmed by marianne//

Write	label1	Slug: op-ellsberg3
-------	--------	--------------------

THE SPEECH WRITERS

"

Write	hed	Slug: op-ellsberg3
-------	-----	--------------------

War of the Words

Write	dek	Slug: op-ellsberg3
-------	-----	--------------------

A pep talk by Bush haunts an author of LBJ's address.

Write	txt	Slug: op-ellsberg3
-------	-----	--------------------

BY **DANIEL ELLSBERG**

vb_9p

President Bush's explanation Tuesday night for staying the course in Iraq evoked in me a sense of familiarity, but not nostalgia. I had heard virtually all of his themes before, almost word for word, in speeches delivered by three presidents I worked for: John F. Kennedy, Lyndon B. Johnson and Richard M. Nixon. Not with pride, I recognized that I had proposed some of those very words myself.

Drafting a speech on the Vietnam War for Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara in July of 1965, I had the same task as Bush's speechwriters in June 2005: how to rationalize and motivate continued public support for a hopelessly stalemated, unnecessary war our president had lied us into.

Looking back on my draft, I find I used the word "terrorist" about our adversaries to the same effect ~~even more than Bush did~~. Like Bush's advisors, I ~~too~~ felt the need for a global threat to explain the scale of effort we faced. For that role, I felt "China" was better suited as our "real" adversary than North Vietnam's Ho Chi Minh, just as Bush now prefers to focus on Al Qaeda rather than Iraqi nationalists. "They are trying to shake our will in Iraq — just as they [sic] tried to shake our will on Sept. 11, 2001," he said.

My draft was approved by McNamara, national security advisor McGeorge Bundy and Secretary of State Dean Rusk, but it was not delivered because it was a clarion call for mobilizing the Reserves to support an open-ended escalation of troops, as Johnson's military commanders had urged. ~~(The counterpart now would be to reinstitute the draft). Johnson chose instead to make a rather offhand statement at a news conference because he wanted to conceal what his military advisors were telling him was necessary to succeed.~~ LBJ preferred instead to lie at a press conference about the number of troops they had requested for immediate deployment (twice the level he announced) and to conceal the total

number they believed necessary for success, which was at least 500,000 troops. (I take with a grain of salt Bush's claim that "our commanders tell me they have the number of troops they need to do their job.)

A note particularly reminiscent in Bush's speech was his reference to "a time of testing." "We have more work to do, and there will be tough moments that test America's resolve," he said.

This theme recalled a passage in my 1965 draft that, for reasons that will be evident, I have never chosen to reproduce before. I ended by painting a picture of communist China as "an opponent that views international politics as a whole as a vast guerrilla struggle, in which a stronger enemy's weak points are to be found and patiently exploited. A Communist world dominated by Peking, they know, lies a long way off. But the way to it is the guerrilla's way, ...intimidating, ambushing, demoralizing and weakening those who would uphold an alternative world order.

"We are being tested," I wrote. "Have we the guts, the grit, the determination to stick with a frustrating, bloody, difficult course as long as it takes to see it through. . . . ? The Asian communists are sure that we have not." (Note to White House speechwriters — in years ahead, for "Asian communists," substitute Al Qaeda, or later, Iran, or still later, China again.)

Tuesday, Bush said: Our adversaries "believe that free societies are essentially corrupt and decadent, and with a few hard blows they can force us to retreat." His ~~Bush's~~ speechwriters, like me, then faced this question from the other side. To meet the enemy's test of resolve, how long must the American public support ~~American~~ troops as they kill and die in a foreign land. ~~Iraq?~~ Their ~~The~~ answer came in the same workmanlike evasions that served Kennedy, Johnson and Nixon: "as long as it takes (and not a day longer) ... until the fight is won. . . . "

~~I no longer commend~~ I can no longer bear to reread my own proposed response in 1965 to that question, which drew on a famous riposte by ~~former Democratic presidential nominee~~ the late U.N. Ambassador Adlai Stevenson during the Cuban Missile Crisis:

"There is only one answer for us to give. It was made ... by an American statesman ... in the midst of another crisis that tested our resolution. Till hell freezes over."

It doesn't feel any better to hear similar words from yet another president 40 years on, nor will they read any better to his speechwriters years from now. But the human pain they foretell will not be mainly theirs.

Write	signer_element	Slug: op-ellsberg3
-------	----------------	--------------------

Daniel Ellsberg worked in the State and Defense departments under Presidents Kennedy, Johnson and Nixon. He released the Pentagon Papers to the press in 1971.

"We are being tested," I wrote. "Have we the guts, the grit, the determination to stick with a frustrating, bloody, difficult course as long as it takes to see it through...? The Asian Communists are sure that we have not." [Note to White House speechwriterS inTHE years ahead-- substitute, Al Qaeda, or later, Iran, or still later, China again.]

Tuesday, Bush said: Our adversaries "believe that free societies are essentially corrupt and decadent, and with a few hard blows they can force us to retreat."

Bush's speechwriters,LIKE ME,[or,ASIDID] then faced this question from the other side. To meet the enemy's test of resolve, how long must the American public support American troops as they kill and die inINAFORIGNLAND? The answer came in the same workmanlike evasions that served Kennedy, Johnson and Nixon: "as long as it takes (and not a day longer)...until the fight is won..."

I CANHARDLYBEAR TO REREADmy own proposed response to that questionIN1965, which drew on a famous riposte bythe lateUN Ambassador Adlai Stevenson during the Cuban Missile Crisis:

"There is only one answer for us to give. It was madeby an American statesmanin the midst of another crisis that tested our resolution. Till hell freezes over."

It doesn't feel any better to hear similar words from yet another president 40 years on, nor will they read any better to his speechwriters years from now. But the human pain they foretell will not be mainly theirs.

President Bush's explanation Tuesday night for staying the course in Iraq evoked in me a sense of familiarity, but not nostalgia. I had heard virtually all of his themes before, almost word for word, in speeches delivered by three presidents I worked for: John F. Kennedy, Lyndon B. Johnson and Richard M. Nixon. Not with pride, I recognized that I had proposed some of those very words myself.

Drafting a speech on Vietnam for Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara in July of 1965, I had the same task as Bush's speechwriters in June 2005: how to rationalize and motivate continued public support for a hopelessly stalemated, unnecessary war our president had lied us into.

Looking back on my draft, I find I used the word "terrorist" about our adversaries **even more than** TO THE SAME EFFECT THAT Bush did. ALSO, like Bush's advisors, I, **too**, felt the need for a global threat to explain the scale of effort we faced. For that role, I felt "China" was better suited as our "real" adversary than North Vietnam's Ho Chi Minh, just as Bush now prefers to focus on Al Qaeda rather than Iraqi nationalists. "They are trying to shake our will in Iraq—just as they [sic] tried to shake our will on Sept. 11, 2001," he said.

My draft was approved by McNamara, National Security Advisor McGeorge Bundy and Secretary of State Dean Rusk, but it was not delivered because it was a clarion call for mobilizing the reserves to support an open-ended escalation of troops. (The counterpart now would be to reinstitute the draft). Johnson chose instead to make a rather off-hand AND DECEPTIVE statement at a press conference because he wanted to conceal what his military advisors were telling him was necessary to succeed.

A note particularly reminiscent in Bush's speech was his reference to "a time of testing." "We have more work to do, and there will be tough moments that test America's resolve...", he said.

This theme recalled a passage in my 1965 draft that, for reasons that will be evident, I have never chosen to reproduce before. I ended by painting a picture of Communist China as "an opponent that views international politics as a whole as a vast guerrilla struggle, in which a stronger enemy's weak points are to be found [**and patiently exploited. A Communist world dominated by Peking, they know, lies a long way off. But the way to it is the guerrilla's way**] AND EXPLOITED ...

intimidating, ambushing, demoralizing and weakening those who would uphold an alternative world order.]SUGGESTED CHANGE:... It demands, above all, patience; and a long-term confidence based on contempt for the patience, the will and resolution of the opponent. The Peking leadership has both.”

“We are being tested,” I wrote. “Have we the guts, the grit, the determination to stick with a frustrating, bloody, difficult course as long as it takes to see it through...? The Asian Communists are sure that we have not.” [Note to White House speechwriters—in years ahead-- substitute, Al Qaeda, or later, Iran, or still later, China again.]

Tuesday, Bush said: Our adversaries “believe that free societies are essentially corrupt and decadent, and with a few hard blows they can force us to retreat.”

Bush’s speechwriters, LIKE ME, then faced this question from the other side. To meet the enemy’s test of resolve, how long must the American public support American troops as they kill and die in **Iraq A FOREIGN LAND**? Their answer came in the same workmanlike evasions that served Kennedy, Johnson and Nixon: “as long as it takes (and not a day longer)...until the fight is won...”

I no longer commend I CAN HARDLY BEAR TO REREAD my own proposed response IN 1965 to that question, which drew on a famous riposte by **former Democratic presidential nominee** FORMER [or, THE RECENTLY-DECEASED] UN AMBASSADOR Adlai Stevenson during the Cuban Missile Crisis:

“There is only one answer for us to give. It was made...by an American statesman...in the midst of another crisis that tested our resolution. “”Till hell freezes over.”” [**remove internal quotes from last phrase**]

It doesn’t feel any better to hear similar words from yet another president 40 years on, nor will they read any better to his speechwriters years from now. But the human pain they foretell will not be mainly theirs.